arXiv:1205.7079v1 [math.CO] 31 May 2012

THE COMPLEXITY OF TROPICAL MATRIX FACTORIZATION

YAROSLAV SHITOV

Abstract. The tropical arithmetic operations on $\mathbb{R}$ are defined by $a \oplus b = \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \otimes b = a + b$. Let A be a tropical matrix and k a positive integer, the problem of Tropical Matrix Factorization (TMF) asks whether there exist tropical matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ satisfying $B \otimes C = A$. We show that no algorithm for TMF is likely to work in polynomial time for every fixed k, thus resolving a problem proposed by Barvinok in 1993. TMF is also shown to be hard for matrices with bounded tropical rank. Proving that TMF can be solved by a polynomial-time algorithm if $k \leq 3$, we answer a question posed by Develin, Santos, and Sturmfels. Another question they have posed asks whether every tropical matrix of factor rank k has a rank-k submatrix of size at most $N(k) \times N(k)$; we answer this question in the negative for every $k > 4$.

1. Introduction

The *tropical semiring* is the set $\mathbb{R}$ of real numbers equipped with the operations of tropical addition and tropical multiplication, which are defined by $a \oplus b = \min\{a, b\}$, $a \otimes b = a + b$. The tropical semiring is essentially the same structure as the *max-plus algebra*, which is the set $\mathbb{R}$ with the operations of maximum and sum, and is being studied since the 1960's, when the applications in the optimization theory have been found [33]. The tropical arithmetic operations on $\mathbb{R}$, which allow us to formulate a number of important non-linear problems in a linear-like way, arise indeed in a variety of topics in pure and applied mathematics. The study of tropical mathematics has applications in operations research [12], discrete event systems [6], automata theory [32], optimal control [28, 29], algebraic geometry [15, 16], and others; we refer to [23] for a detailed survey of applications. A considerable number of important problems in tropical mathematics has a linear-algebraic nature. For instance, the concepts of eigenvalue and eigenvector, the theory of linear systems, and the algorithms for computing rank functions are useful for different applications [1, 15, 19, 23]. Some applications also give rise to studying the multiplicative structure of tropical matrices [31], and in this context, the Burnside-type problems are important [22, 32]. Another interesting problem is to study the subgroup structure of the semigroup of tropical matrices under multiplication [25, 26].

In our paper, we consider the problem of matrix factorization, which is also related to the concept of factor rank of matrices over semirings [8]. The study of factor rank dates back to the 1980's [9], and has now numerous applications in different contexts of mathematics. Being considered on the semiring of nonnegative matrices, the factor rank is known as nonnegative rank and has applications in quantum mechanics, statistics, demography, and others [11]. The factor rank of matrices over the binary Boolean semiring is also called Boolean rank and has applications in combinatorics and graph theory [7, 24]. Finally, for matrices over a field, the factor rank coincides with the classical rank function.

In the context of matrices over the tropical semiring, the factor rank is also known as *combinatorial rank* [3] and *Barvinok rank* [15], and the study of this notion has arisen from combinatorial optimization [2]. The factor rank appears in the formulation of a number of problems in optimization, for instance, in the Traveling Salesman problem with warehouses [4]. Also, the notion of factor rank is of interest in the study of tropical geometry [14, 15], where the factor rank can be thought of as the minimum number of points whose tropical convex hull contains the columns of a matrix. Let us define the factor rank function for tropical matrices, assuming that multiplication of tropical matrices is understood as ordinary matrix multiplication with $+$ and $\cdot$ replaced by the tropical operations $\oplus$ and $\otimes$.

Definition 1.1. The *factor rank* of a tropical matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ is the smallest integer k for which there exist tropical matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times k}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ satisfying $B \otimes C = A$.

The most straightforward way of computing the factor rank is based on the quantifier elimination algorithm for the theory of reals with addition and order [17]. Indeed, Definition 1.1 allows us to define the set of all m-by-n matrices with factor rank k by a first-order order formula. We then employ the decision procedure based on the quantifier elimination algorithm provided in [17] to check whether a given m-by-n matrix indeed has factor rank k.

However, the computational complexity of quantifier elimination makes the algorithm mentioned unacceptable for practical use. Another algorithm for computing the factor rank is given by Develin in the paper [14], where he develops the theory of tropical secant varieties. He characterizes the factor rank from a point of view of tropical geometry, and the characterization obtained provides an algorithm for computing the factor rank.

Unfortunately, neither the algorithm by Develin nor any other algorithm is likely to compute the factor rank of a tropical matrix in polynomial time. Indeed, the problem of computing the factor rank is NP-hard even for tropical 01-matrices, see [15]. In other words, the general problem of *Tropical Matrix Factorization* (*TMF*), which asks whether a given matrix A and a given integer k are such that $A = B \otimes C$ for some $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times k}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$, turns out to be NP-hard.

Besides the general problem of computing the factor rank, the problem of detecting matrices with fixed factor rank deserved attention. Certain hard problems of combinatorial optimization admit fast solutions if the input matrices are required to have factor rank bounded by a fixed number [2, 3]. The Traveling Salesman problem (TSP) also admits a fast solution if we require the distance matrix to have a fixed factor rank [4, 5]; this special case of TSP is also known as TSP with warehouses [4]. Matrices with bounded factor rank arise naturally in the problems mentioned and in a number of other problems in combinatorial optimization [2] and tropical geometry [15]. These considerations led to the following interesting question on tropical matrix factorizations.

Question 1.2. [2, 3] Does there exist an algorithm that solves TMF for every fixed k in polynomial time?

In [2], Barvinok expected that Question 1.2 can be answered in the positive, this question has also been mentioned in [3]. Further investigations on the problem of determining matrices with fixed factor rank have been carried out in [10, 13, 14, 15, 20]. However, the problem remained open even in the case $k = 3$ and has been formulated again in [15].

Question 1.3. [15, Section 8, Question 2] Is there a polynomial-time algorithm that decides whether a given tropical matrix has factor rank 3?

In [15], a number of related problems has also been posed. The following question asks whether the set of matrices with fixed factor rank can be defined by ranks of the submatrices of bounded size.

Question 1.4. [15, Section 8, Question 3a] Is there a number $N(k)$ such that if all minors of a tropical matrix A of size at most $N(k)$ have factor rank at most k then A itself has factor rank at most k?

Assume that Question 1.4 is answered in the positive for some k. To solve Problem 2.1, it is then sufficient to check whether every minor of size at most $N(k) \times N(k)$ has factor rank at most k. The number of minors of fixed size is easily seen to be polynomial in the size of a matrix, and each of these minors can be treated in fixed time thanks to, say, quantifier elimination algorithm. Thus we see that, indeed, as noted in [15], a positive answer to Question 1.4 would allow to construct a fast algorithm for recognizing tropical matrices with factor rank k.

Besides the factor rank, there are other important rank concepts for tropical matrices, see [1, 15]. One of them is presented by the function of tropical rank, which arises naturally in tropical linear algebra and tropical geometry [15]. First, we define the *tropical permanent* (which is also called the *tropical determinant*) of a tropical matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ as

$$\operatorname{perm}(D) = \min_{\sigma\in\mathcal{S}_n} \left\{ D_{1,\sigma(1)} + \ldots + D_{n,\sigma(n)} \right\}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_n$ stands for the symmetric group on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. D is said to be *tropically singular* if the minimum in (1.1) is attained at least twice. The *tropical rank* of a tropical matrix A is the largest integer r such that A has a non-singular r-by-r submatrix. Now we can formulate another problem related to the complexity of tropical matrix factorization.

Question 1.5. [15, Section 8, Question 3b] Is there a polynomial-time algorithm for the factor rank of matrices with bounded tropical rank?

The progress in solving the problems we have mentioned has mostly been based on studying matrices with factor rank at most 2, and the set of such matrices is now indeed well studied. First, the TMF problem with $k \leq 2$ can be solved by a linear-time algorithm, see [10, 15]. Further, it has been proven in [15] that the factor rank of a matrix is at most 2 if and only if all its 3-by-3 minors have factor ranks at most 2. The set of d-by-n matrices with factor rank 2 has been studied as a simplicial complex in [13]. This set has also been studied from the topological point of view in [20], and the space of d-by-n matrices of factor rank two modulo translation and rescaling has been shown to form a manifold. For $k \geq 3$, the question of fast algorithm for recognizing tropical matrices with factor rank k remained open.

In our paper, we answer Question 1.2, showing that no algorithm is likely to solve TMF in polynomial time for every fixed k. More precisely, we show that the problem of recognizing tropical matrices with factor rank 8 is NP-hard. However, it turns out that the answer for Question 1.3 is positive. We also answer Question 1.4 in the negative for every $k \geq 4$ and obtain a negative answer for Question 1.5.

The following notation is used throughout our paper. By A_{ij} we will denote the (i, j)th entry of a matrix A, by $A[r_1, \dots, r_p | c_1, \dots, c_q]$ the submatrix of A formed by the rows with labels $r_1, \dots, r_p$ and columns with $c_1, \dots, c_q$. We will say that tropical matrices $B, C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ coincide modulo *scaling* if there exist real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$, $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ such that $B_{ij} = C_{ij} + \alpha_i + \beta_j$ for all i and j. Straightforwardly, B and C have the same tropical and the same factor ranks in that case.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we give a more specific formulation for the TMF problem and prove the preliminary results on computational complexity of this problem. We describe the construction of the extended tropical semiring $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, which will be helpful for further considerations, and we prove a number of auxiliary results on the factor rank of matrices over $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$.

2.1. Tropical matrix k-factorization.

We will consider a family of decision problems which specify a value of inner dimension k in the general formulation of the TMF problem. We require an input matrix to consist of integers in these problems, since this assumption will be convenient in our further considerations. For a positive integer k, the problem we deal with is as follows.

Problem 2.1. TROPICAL MATRIX k-FACTORIZATION (k-TMF).

Given a tropical matrix $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$.

Question: Do there exist tropical matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ satisfying $B \otimes C = A$?

In the input of Problem 2.1, as well as throughout our paper, we assume that an integer matrix is presented in the usual way as a rectangular array of numbers written in the decimal system. Namely, matrices will be considered to be words over the alphabet that consists of the characters "0", "1", ..., "9", "+", "-", a space, and an end-of-line symbol. In particular, the size of the input in Problem 2.1 equals $\sum\limits_{i,j} [\log_{10} \max\{|A_{ij}|, 1\}] + 3mn$, where $[x]$ denotes the integer part of x.

Now we will prove that the TMF problem belongs to the class NP if an input matrix is required to consist of integers. We need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let a matrix $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ have factor rank at most k. Let g and l denote, respectively, the greatest and the least elements of A, set also $h = |g| + |l|$. Then there exist matrices $B \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times k}$ and $C \in \mathbb{Z}^{k \times n}$ such that $B \otimes C = A$ and $|B_{i\tau}| \leq h$, $|C_{\tau j}| \leq h$ for any triple of indexes (i, j, τ).*

Proof. By Definition 1.1, there are matrices $B' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ and $C' \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ satisfying $B' \otimes C' = A$. Consider matrices B'' and C'' defined by $B''_{i\tau} = B'_{i\tau} - \{B'_{i\tau}\}$, $C''_{\tau j} = C'_{\tau j} + \{-C'_{\tau j}\}$, where $\{x\} = x - [x]$ is the fractional part of x. The matrices B'' and C'' are then integer, and we have $|(B''_{i\tau} + C''_{\tau j}) - (B'_{i\tau} + C'_{\tau j})| < 1$. Therefore, $B'_{i\tau} + C'_{\tau j} = A_{ij}$ implies $B''_{i\tau} + C''_{\tau j} = A_{ij}$, and from $B'_{i\tau} + C'_{\tau j} \geq A_{ij}$ it follows that $B''_{i\tau} + C''_{\tau j} \geq A_{ij}$. Thus we have that $B' \otimes C' = A$ implies $B'' \otimes C'' = A$.

Further, we subtract b_τ, the least element of the τth column of B'', from every entry of the τth column of B'' and add b_τ to every entry of the τth row of C''. The matrices B and C obtained satisfy $B \otimes C = A$, and zero appears as the minimal element of every column of B. The definition of matrix multiplication then shows that every entry of C is greater than or equal to l. Finally, those entries of B and C that are greater than $|g| + |l|$ can be then replaced by $|g| + |l|$ without changing the product $B \otimes C$. $\square$

Now we can prove our first results concerning the computational complexity of tropical matrix factorization.

Theorem 2.3. *Given a tropical matrix $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ and a positive integer k. The problem of deciding whether A has factor rank at most k belongs to the class NP.*

Proof. The factor rank of A is at most $\min\{m, n\}$ (see [15, Proposition 2.1]), so the problem can be solved immediately if $k \geq \min\{m, n\}$. For $k < \min\{m, n\}$, we apply Lemma 2.2. If A has factor rank at most k, then there exist matrices $B \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times k}$ and $C \in \mathbb{Z}^{k \times n}$ that satisfy $B \otimes C = A$ and require at most $(m + n)k\,(\log_{10} h + 3)$ symbols to be written (h denotes here the sum of the absolute values of the greatest and the least elements of A). The size of the input data of the problem considered is at least $\log_{10} \frac{h}{2} + mn$, so the result follows. $\square$

Theorem 2.3 shows that TMF, the general problem of tropical matrix factorization, belongs to NP if the input matrices are assumed to consist of integers. The problem k-TMF, introduced in this section, is thus in NP as well.

Theorem 2.4. *The k-TMF problem belongs to NP.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 2.3. $\square$

2.2. **Extended tropical semiring.** It will be useful for our further considerations to extend the tropical semiring by an infinite positive element, which we denote by ∞. We also write $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ for $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and assume $a \oplus \infty = a$, $a \otimes \infty = \infty$ for $a \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$.

Defining the factor rank, one can now think of a tropical matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ as a matrix over $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, and allow matrices B and C from Definition 1.1 to contain infinite elements. However, it turns out that the rank function defined in this way is the same as that defined with respect to Definition 1.1. Indeed, if matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{m \times k}$, $C \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{k \times n}$ satisfy $A = B \otimes C$, then we can replace infinite entries of B and C with a sufficiently large real without changing the product of the matrices.

We can therefore extend Definition 1.1 to the case of matrices over $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and define the *factor rank* of $A \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{m \times n}$ to be the smallest integer k for which there exist $B \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{m \times k}$ and $C \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{k \times n}$ satisfying $A = B \otimes C$. The following technical lemma will play an important role in the considerations of our paper.

Lemma 2.5. *Let zero appear as a minimal element of every row and every column of a matrix $A \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{m \times n}$. Consider the matrix A' obtained from A by replacing every infinite entry with the number $2g + 1$, where g stands for the maximal finite entry of A. Then the factor ranks of A and A' are the same.*

Proof. Consider matrices $B' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ and $C' \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ satisfying $B' \otimes C' = A'$. For $t \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, we subtract b_t, the least element of the tth column of B, from every entry of that column and add b_t to every entry of the tth row of C. The matrices B'' and C'' obtained satisfy $B'' \otimes C'' = A'$, and zero appears as a minimal element of every row of B'' and of every column of C''. Further, we replace by ∞ every entry of B'' and C'' that is greater than g, and we denote the matrices obtained by B and C. It is then easy to check that $B \otimes C = A$.

So we have proven that the factor rank of A is at most that of A'. It is thus sufficient to note that $A' = E \otimes A$, where E stands for an m-by-m tropical matrix satisfying $E_{ij} = 0$ if $i = j$ and $E_{ij} = 2g + 1$ otherwise. $\square$

The following easy observation will also be useful.

Proposition 2.6. *The factor rank of a tropical matrix* $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ *is one less than that of the matrix* $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1)\times(n+1)}$ *defined by* $A'_{ij} = A_{ij}$*,* $A'_{i,n+1} = A'_{m+1,j} = \infty$ *for* $i \leq m$*,* $j \leq n$*, and* $A'_{m+1,n+1} = 0$*.*

The rest of our paper is organized as follows. In Section 3, we consider the k-TMF problem for large enough values of inner dimension k. We show that k-TMF is NP-complete for $k \geq 8$, thus giving a negative answer for Question 1.2. As a corollary of this result, we show that the problem of deciding whether the factor rank of a matrix A exceeds 8 is NP-hard even if A is assumed to have tropical rank at most 8; in particular, this gives a negative answer for Question 1.5. Note that this situation is in contrast with that of the Gondran–Minoux rank, which can be computed in polynomial time if a given matrix has bounded tropical rank [18]. In Section 4, we consider the problem of tropical matrix factorization for small values of k. We construct an algorithm that requires at most $O\left((m+n)^3 mn \log(mn) + m^3n^3\right)$ arithmetic operations and decides whether a given matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ has factor rank at most 3. This answers Question 1.3 in the affirmative and shows that the 3-TMF problem belongs to the class P. In Section 5, we consider the question of whether matrices with fixed factor rank are defined by ranks of their bounded-size minors, and we give a negative answer for Question 1.4 in the case when $k \geq 4$.

3. 8-TMF IS NP-COMPLETE

In this section, we consider the problem of tropical matrix factorization for sufficiently large but fixed values of k, and show that this problem remains hard if the dimension k is assumed to be bounded. We show that no algorithm is likely to solve k-TMF efficiently if $k \geq 8$. More precisely, we construct a polynomial-time reduction from an NP-complete problem to k-TMF, thus proving that k-TMF is NP-hard. In other words, we show that efficient solution of k-TMF would provide efficient solutions to many problems that are of interest for a long time and widely believed to be hard [21]. Therefore, the results of this section give a negative answer for Question 1.2. As a corollary, we obtain a negative answer for Question 1.5.

The NP-complete problem which we reduce to k-TMF is known as SET SPLITTING. This problem has been considered in [21] and is formulated as follows.

Problem 3.1. SET SPLITTING.

Given a set S and a family $\mathcal{C}$ of subsets of S.

Question: Are there sets Φ_1 and Φ_2 such that $\Phi_1 \cap \Phi_2 = \emptyset$, $\Phi_1 \cup \Phi_2 = S$, and no subset from $\mathcal{C}$ is entirely contained in either Φ_1 or Φ_2?

3.1. **Reformulation of SET SPLITTING and some specific conventions.**

Our reduction to k-TMF, however, does not go from SET SPLITTING directly. Let us introduce the following reformulation of SET SPLITTING, which is useful for our considerations.

Problem 3.2. SET SPLITTING REFORMULATED.

Given a nondecreasing integer sequence $\sigma_0 = 0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_m$ and a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets $\mathcal{R}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{R}_n$ such that $\mathcal{R}_1 \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{R}_n = \{1, \ldots, \sigma_m\}$.

Question: Are there sets Φ_1 and Φ_2 such that $\Phi_1 \cap \Phi_2 = \emptyset$, $\Phi_1 \cup \Phi_2 = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and the sets

$$\left(\bigcup_{i \in \Phi_1} \mathcal{R}_i \right) \bigcap \{x \mid \sigma_{\mu-1} < x \leq \sigma_\mu\} \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_{i \in \Phi_2} \mathcal{R}_i \right) \bigcap \{x \mid \sigma_{\mu-1} < x \leq \sigma_\mu\}$$

are both nonempty for every $\mu \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$?

Problem 3.2, as well as SET SPLITTING, turns out to be NP-complete.

Lemma 3.3. *Problem 3.2 is NP-complete.*

Proof. Let $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_n\}$ be a set and $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_m$ a sequence of its subsets, by Ψ we denote the set of all pairs $(s_i, \mathcal{C}_j)$ satisfying $s_i \in \mathcal{C}_j$. We set $\sigma_0 = 0$ and $\sigma_\mu = |\mathcal{C}_1| + \ldots + |\mathcal{C}_\mu|$ for every $\mu \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then it is easy to construct a bijection $\nu : \Psi \to \{1, \ldots, \sigma_m\}$ mapping every $(s_i, \mathcal{C}_j) \in \Psi$ to some integer x satisfying $\sigma_{j-1} < x \leq \sigma_j$. Finally, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we define $\mathcal{R}_i$ to consist of all numbers whose preimage under ν has s_i as the first entry. These settings can be straightforwardly checked to give a polynomial reduction from SET SPLITTING (which is known to be NP-complete, see [21]) to Problem 3.2. On the other hand, the fact that Problem 3.2 is in NP is clear. $\square$

Our way of proving that 8-TMF is NP-hard is based on the polynomial-time reduction from Problem 3.2. In order to describe this reduction explicitly, we need to specify some conventions that will be used throughout this section. We will denote the input data of Problem 3.2 by $\Sigma = (\sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_m)$, $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{R}_n)$. The conventions to be used are given by the following remarks.

Remark 3.4. Note that if $|\sigma_i - \sigma_j| < 2$ for some distinct i and j, then the answer for Problem 3.2 is trivially 'no'. Consequently, Problem 3.2 remains NP-complete under an additional assumption that $|\sigma_i - \sigma_j| < 2$ implies $i = j$. In what follows, we suppose that Σ satisfies this assumption.

Remark 3.5. The formulation of Problem 3.2 requires that for every $u \in \{1, \ldots, \sigma_m\}$, there exists a unique $\nu = \nu(u)$ such that $u \in \mathcal{R}_\nu$.

Remark 3.6. For any $u \in \{1, \ldots, \sigma\}$ and $v \in \{1, \ldots, \sigma - m\}$, we set

$$\gamma_u = 20u - 10\lambda - 9, \quad \rho_v = 20v + 10\mu + 1, \tag{3.1}$$

where λ and μ stand for the maximal subscripts satisfying $u \geq \sigma_\lambda$ and $v > \sigma_\mu - \mu$, respectively. We will also write σ for σ_m, and G for the number 21σ.

3.2. **Encoding the input of Problem 3.2 by a matrix.** Let us now begin to describe the reduction from Problem 3.2 to 8-TMF. Namely, this subsection is devoted to the construction of a tropical matrix $A = A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ which we assign to the input data $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ of Problem 3.2. By our setting, the matrix A will have $\sigma - m + n + 9$ rows and $\sigma + 10$ columns. The following convention will be useful to present this matrix in a more concise way: The rows of A will be labeled with the elements of the set

$$\mathcal{I} = \{1\spadesuit, \ldots, 9\spadesuit, 1\diamondsuit, \ldots, n\diamondsuit, 1\heartsuit, \ldots, (\sigma - m)\heartsuit\},$$

the columns with the elements of

$$\mathcal{J} = \{1\natural, \ldots, 10\natural, 1\sharp, \ldots, \sigma\sharp\}.$$

Now we can define the entries of $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$.

Definition 3.7. *Let $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ be the input of Problem 3.2, u be an arbitrary number from $\{1, \ldots, \sigma\}$, v from $\{1, \ldots, \sigma - m\}$, η from $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. By ρ_u, γ_v, and G we denote the numbers from Remark 3.6. The entries of the matrix $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R}) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{|\mathcal{I}| \times |\mathcal{J}|}$ are defined as follows.*

1. *If u and v are such that $u = v + \mu = \sigma_\mu$ for some $\mu \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, then $A_{v\heartsuit, u\sharp} = \min\{\gamma_u, \rho_v, 10(u+v) - 11\}$. Otherwise, if no μ satisfying that condition exists, then $A_{v\heartsuit, u\sharp} = \min\{\gamma_u, \rho_v, 10(u+v) - 10\}$.*
2. *$A_{\eta\diamondsuit, u\sharp} = \min\{\gamma_u, G - 2G\,|\eta - \nu(u)|\}$ (recall that $\nu(u)$ denotes a number such that the condition $u \in \mathcal{R}_{\nu(u)}$ is satisfied).*
3. *$A_{v\heartsuit, 7\natural} = 0$, $A_{v\heartsuit, 8\natural} = \rho_v$, $A_{v\heartsuit, 9\natural} = A_{v\heartsuit, 10\natural} = \infty$; $A_{v\heartsuit, \tau\natural} = 2$ for $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$.*
4. *$A_{\eta\diamondsuit, 1\natural} = A_{\eta\diamondsuit, 6\natural} = A_{\eta\diamondsuit, 7\natural} = 2$, $A_{\eta\diamondsuit, 8\natural} = -2\eta G$, $A_{\eta\diamondsuit, 9\natural} = 2\eta G$, $A_{\eta\diamondsuit, 10\natural} = 2(n+1-\eta)G$; $A_{\eta\diamondsuit, \tau'\natural} = 0$ for $\tau' \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$.*
5. *$A_{1\spadesuit, u\sharp} = A_{2\spadesuit, u\sharp} = A_{3\spadesuit, u\sharp} = 2$, $A_{4\spadesuit, u\sharp} = 0$, $A_{6\spadesuit, u\sharp} = 10u - 3$, $A_{7\spadesuit, u\sharp} = \gamma_u$, $A_{8\spadesuit, u\sharp} = -2G\nu(u) + G$, $A_{9\spadesuit, u\sharp} = -2G(n+1-\nu(u)) + G$.*
6. *If $u = \sigma_{\mu-1} + 1$ for some $\mu \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, then $A_{5\spadesuit, u\sharp} = 10u + 1$; otherwise, $A_{5\spadesuit, u\sharp} = 10u - 3$.*
7. *The matrix $A[1\spadesuit, \ldots, 9\spadesuit | 1\natural, \ldots, 10\natural]$ equals*

$$\begin{pmatrix}
2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\
2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\
0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty \\
2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \infty & \infty \\
2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty & \infty \\
\infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & \infty \\
\infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & G' & \infty & 0
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.2}$$

   where G' stands for $-2(n+1)G$.

It is easy enough to show that the function assigning the matrix $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ to a tuple $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ has the polynomial complexity.

Lemma 3.8. *Given a tuple $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$. The number of operations needed to construct the matrix $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ is polynomial in the size of the data.*

Proof. The numbers of the rows and columns of $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ are given by linear functions of variables appearing in the data. On the other hand, every entry of $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ can clearly be computed in bounded number of operations. □

We will further consider tropical factorizations of the matrix $A = A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$. In order to adapt the notation of the row and column indexes of A to the product of matrices, we need the following convention.

Remark 3.9. Throughout this section, for considering matrices B and C satisfying $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R}) = B \otimes C$, we will use the following notation. The elements of $\mathcal{I}$ will label the rows of B, the elements of $\mathcal{J}$ the columns of C, the numbers $1, \ldots, k$ the columns of B as well as the rows of C. In our settings, $A = B \otimes C$ means that $A_{ij} = \min_{\tau=1}^{k}\{B_{i\tau} + C_{\tau j}\}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$.

The following lemma shows that the factor rank of $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ does not exceed 8 if the question of Problem 3.2 is answered in the affirmative on the query $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let an input* $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ *be such that the answer in Problem 3.2 is 'yes'. Then there are matrices* $B \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{|\mathcal{I}| \times 8}$ *and* $C \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{8 \times |\mathcal{J}|}$ *such that* $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R}) = B \otimes C$.

Proof. The assumption of the lemma implies that there exist Φ_1 and Φ_2 such that $\Phi_1 \cap \Phi_2 = \emptyset$, $\Phi_1 \cup \Phi_2 = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and the sets

$$\left(\bigcup_{i \in \Phi_1} \mathcal{R}_i \right) \bigcap \{\sigma_{\mu-1} + 1, \ldots, \sigma_\mu\} \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_{i \in \Phi_2} \mathcal{R}_i \right) \bigcap \{\sigma_{\mu-1} + 1, \ldots, \sigma_\mu\}$$

are both nonempty for every $\mu \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

Then for every μ, the set $\{\nu(\sigma_{\mu-1} + 1), \ldots, \nu(\sigma_\mu)\}$ has nonempty intersections with both Φ_1 and Φ_2 (recall that, with respect to Remark 3.5, $\nu(u)$ denotes a unique number for which the condition $u \in \mathcal{R}_{\nu(u)}$ is satisfied). By $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ we will denote the greatest number of the set $\{\sigma_{\mu-1} + 1, \ldots, \sigma_\mu\}$ for which the numbers $\nu(\mathcal{H}_\mu)$ and $\nu(\sigma_\mu)$ are neither both in Φ_1 nor both in Φ_2.

Now we can present the matrices B and C. In the rest of our proof, we will denote an arbitrary number from $\{1, \ldots, \sigma\}$ by u, from $\{1, \ldots, \sigma - m\}$ by v, from $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ by η; also, χ will stand for either 1 or 2. As in Definition 3.7, ρ_u, γ_v, and G stand for the numbers defined in Remark 3.6. In items B4, B5 and C3, we assume that the index μ runs over the set $\{1, \ldots, m\}$.

B1: The matrix $B[1\spadesuit, \ldots, 9\spadesuit | 1, \ldots, 8]$ is equal to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ 2 & 2 & \infty & 0 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ 0 & 0 & \infty & \infty & 0 & 0 & \infty & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & \infty & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.3}$$

B2: We take $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,\chi} = 0$ if $\eta \in \Phi_\chi$, and $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,\chi} = \infty$ if $\eta \notin \Phi_\chi$; take also $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,3} = 0$, $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,4} = B_{\eta\diamondsuit,5} = \infty$, $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,6} = 2$, $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,7} = 2\eta G$, and $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,8} = 2(n + 1 - \eta)G$.

B3: We set $B_{v\heartsuit,3} = B_{v\heartsuit,7} = B_{v\heartsuit,8} = \infty$, $B_{v\heartsuit,4} = B_{v\heartsuit,5} = \rho_v$, $B_{v\heartsuit,6} = 0$.

B4: If $g \in \{\sigma_{\mu-1} - \mu + 2, \ldots, \sigma_\mu - \mu\}$ is less than $\mathcal{H}_\mu - \mu + 1$, then we set $B_{g\heartsuit,\chi} = 10g - 7$; if g is greater than $\mathcal{H}_\mu - \mu + 1$, then $B_{g\heartsuit,\chi} = 10g - 8$.

B5: Finally, if $g = \mathcal{H}_\mu - \mu + 1$, then we take $B_{g\heartsuit,\chi} = 10g - 8$ if $\nu(\mathcal{H}_\mu) \in \Phi_\chi$, and $B_{g\heartsuit,\chi} = 10g - 7$ if $\nu(\mathcal{H}_\mu) \notin \Phi_\chi$.

We proceed with the description of the matrix C.

C1: The matrix $C[1, \ldots, 8 | 1\natural, \ldots, 10\natural]$ is equal to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty & \infty \\ 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty & \infty \\ 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty & \infty \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & G' & \infty & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4}$$

with G' standing for $-2(n+1)G$.

C2: We set $C_{3u\sharp} = C_{6,u\sharp} = \gamma_u$, $C_{4u\sharp} = 0$, $C_{5,u\sharp} = A_{5\spadesuit,u\sharp}$, $C_{7,u\sharp} = -2\nu(u)G + G$, $C_{8,u\sharp} = -2(n+1-\nu(u))G + G$.

C3: Assume $h \in \{\sigma_{\mu-1}+1, \ldots, \sigma_\mu\}$. We set $C_{\chi,h\sharp} = \gamma_h$ if $\nu(h) \in \Phi_\chi$, set also $C_{\chi,h\sharp} = 10h-2$ if $\nu(h) \notin \Phi_\chi$ and $\mathcal{H}_\mu < h < \sigma_\mu$, finally, set $C_{\chi,h\sharp} = 10h-3$ if $\nu(h) \notin \Phi_\chi$ and either $h \leq \mathcal{H}_\mu$ or $h = \sigma_\mu$.

It is straightforward to check that the matrices $B \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{|\mathcal{I}|\times 8}$ and $C \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{8\times|\mathcal{J}|}$ are well defined. In order to complete our proof, we need to verify that indeed $B \otimes C = A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, that is,

$$A_{ij} = \min_{\tau=1}^{8}\{B_{i\tau} + C_{\tau j}\} \tag{3.5}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Consider the six possible cases.

1.For $i \in \{1\spadesuit, \ldots, 9\spadesuit\}$ and $j \in \{1\natural, \ldots, 10\natural\}$, it suffices to check that the product of the matrices (3.3) and (3.4) equals the matrix (3.2).

2. Let $i = \eta\diamondsuit$ and $j \in \{1\natural, \ldots, 10\natural\}$. We need to verify that the row $(A_{\eta\diamondsuit,1\natural}, \ldots, A_{\eta\diamondsuit,10\natural})$ is a product of the row of B labeled by $\eta\diamondsuit$ and the tropical matrix (3.4). Namely, we need to check that the row $(B_{\eta\diamondsuit,1},\, B_{\eta\diamondsuit,2},\, 0,\, \infty,\, \infty,\, 2,\, 2\eta G,\, 2(n+1-\eta)G)$ multiplied by the tropical matrix (3.4) equals $(2,\, 0,\, 0,\, 0,\, 0,\, 2,\, 2,\, -2\eta G,\, 2\eta G,\, 2(n+1-\eta)G)$. We note that also $\{B_{\eta\diamondsuit,1},\, B_{\eta\diamondsuit,2}\} = \{0, \infty\}$ by the definition of B, checking is then straightforward.

3. For $i = v\heartsuit$ and $j \in \{1\natural, \ldots, 10\natural\}$, checking (3.5) means checking that the row $(A_{v\heartsuit,1\natural}, \ldots, A_{v\heartsuit,10\natural})$ is a product of the row of B labeled by $v\heartsuit$ and the tropical matrix (3.4). We note that $\min\{B_{v\heartsuit,1},\, B_{v\heartsuit,2}\} \geq 2$ by the definition of B. Then the row $(B_{v\heartsuit,1},\, B_{v\heartsuit,2},\, \infty,\, \rho_v,\, \rho_v,\, 0,\, \infty,\, \infty)$ multiplied by the tropical matrix (3.4) can be straightforwardly checked to equal the row $(2,\, 2,\, 2,\, 2,\, 2,\, 2,\, 0,\, \rho_v,\, \infty,\, \infty)$.

4. Further, assume $i \in \{1\spadesuit, \ldots, 9\spadesuit\}$ and $j = u\sharp$. Observe that we have $\min\{C_{1,u\sharp}, C_{2,u\sharp}\} = 10u-3$ for $u = \sigma_{\mu-1}+1$, and $A_{5\spadesuit,u\sharp} = 10u-3$ for $u \neq \sigma_{\mu-1}+1$. Also, by our settings, $C_{1,u\sharp}, C_{2,u\sharp} \in \{10u-2, 10u-3, \gamma_u\}$ and $A_{5\spadesuit,u\sharp} \in \{10u-3, 10u+1\}$ for any u. So we can check that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ 2 & 2 & \infty & 0 & 2 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & 2 & \infty & \infty \\ 0 & 0 & \infty & \infty & 0 & 0 & \infty & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & \infty & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} C_{1,u\sharp} \\ C_{2,u\sharp} \\ \gamma_u \\ 0 \\ A_{5\spadesuit,u\sharp} \\ \gamma_u \\ G_1 \\ G_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ A_{5\spadesuit,u\sharp} \\ 10u-3 \\ \gamma_u \\ G_1 \\ G_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where G_1 and G_2 stand for $-2G\nu(u) + G$ and $-2G(n+1-\nu(u)) + G$, respectively. This implies that (3.5) holds.

5. Now consider $i = \eta\diamondsuit$ and $j = u\sharp$. In this case, we have $\min\{B_{\eta\diamondsuit,1} + C_{1,u\sharp}, B_{\eta\diamondsuit,2} + C_{2,u\sharp}\} > 0$, and $\min\{B_{\eta\diamondsuit,1} + C_{1,u\sharp}, B_{\eta\diamondsuit,2} + C_{2,u\sharp}\} = \gamma_u$ if $\eta = \nu(u)$. We also have $\min\{B_{\eta\diamondsuit,7} + C_{7,u\sharp}, B_{\eta\diamondsuit,8} + C_{8,u\sharp}\} = G - 2G\,|\eta - \nu(u)|$ and $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,\tau'} + C_{\tau',u\sharp} \geq \gamma_u$ for $\tau' \in \{3,4,5,6\}$. This implies

$$\min_{\tau=1}^{8}\{B_{\eta\diamondsuit,\tau} + C_{\tau,u\sharp}\} = \min\{\gamma_u, G - 2G\,|\eta - \nu(u)|\},$$

thus proving (3.5).

6. Finally, we assume $i = v\heartsuit$, $j = u\sharp$. In this case, the minimum in (3.5) computed for τ running over $\{3, \dots, 8\}$ equals $\min\{\rho_v, \gamma_u\}$. It is therefore sufficient to prove that

$$A_{v\heartsuit,u\sharp} = \min\{B_{v\heartsuit,1} + C_{1,u\sharp}, B_{v\heartsuit,2} + C_{2,u\sharp}, \rho_v, \gamma_u\} \tag{3.6}$$

for all u and v. Note that by the definitions of B and C, it holds that $B_{v\heartsuit,\chi}+C_{\chi,u\sharp} \geq 10u + 10v - 11$ for $\chi \in \{1, 2\}$. By λ and μ we will denote the maximal subscripts satisfying $u \geq \sigma_\lambda$ and $v > \sigma_\mu - \mu$, respectively. Let us consider possible cases.

6.1. If $10u + 10v - 11 \geq \min\{\rho_v, \gamma_u\}$, then the minimum in (3.6) equals $\min\{\rho_v, \gamma_u\}$. Item 1 of Definition 3.7 shows that also $A_{v\heartsuit,u\sharp} = \min\{\rho_v, \gamma_u\}$, proving (3.6).

6.2. If the assumption of item 6.1 fails to hold, then $10u+10v-11 < 20u-10\lambda-9$ and $10u+10v-11 < 20v+10\mu+1$, so that $10v+10\lambda < 10u+2 < 10v+10\mu+14$, and we obtain $v + \mu + 1 \geq u \geq v + \lambda$. In particular, we see that the assumption of item 6.1 holds if $\lambda > \mu + 1$, so (3.6) holds in this case as well.

6.3. Now suppose $\lambda < \mu$. The definition of λ and μ implies $u \leq \sigma_{\lambda+1} - 1$ and $v > \sigma_\mu - \mu$. By Remark 3.4, $\sigma_\mu - \sigma_{\lambda+1} \geq 2(\mu - \lambda - 1)$. Thus we have

$$u \leq \sigma_{\lambda+1} - 1 \leq \sigma_{\lambda+1} + \mu - \lambda - 2 \leq \sigma_\mu - \mu + \lambda < v + \lambda,$$

and then $10v + 10\lambda > 10u + 2$, so $10u + 10v - 11 > \gamma_u$. We see that the assumption of item 6.1 holds again, proving (3.6).

6.4. Further, suppose $\lambda = \mu+1$. By items 6.1 and 6.2, it can be assumed without a loss of generality that $u = v+\lambda$. In this case, the definition of λ and μ shows that $u \geq \sigma_\lambda$ and $v \leq \sigma_\lambda - \lambda$, so we have $u = v + \lambda = \sigma_\lambda$. Note that $\nu(\mathcal{H}_\lambda) \in \Phi_\chi$ if and only if $\nu(\sigma_\lambda) \notin \Phi_\chi$ by the definition of the index $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$. From items B4, B5 and C3 it therefore follows that $\min\{B_{v\heartsuit,1} + C_{1,u\sharp}, B_{v\heartsuit,2} + C_{2,u\sharp}\} = 10u + 10v - 11$, from item 1 of Definition 3.7 that $A_{v\heartsuit,u\sharp} = \min\{10(u + v) - 11, \gamma_u, \rho_v\}$, so (3.6) holds.

6.5. Finally, assume $\lambda = \mu$. We use items 6.1 and 6.2 and then assume without a loss of generality that either $u = v + \mu$ or $u = v + \mu + 1$. In this case, the definition of λ and μ shows that $u \in \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \dots, \sigma_{\mu+1} - 1\}$. Now from items B4, B5 and C3 it follows that $\min\{B_{v\heartsuit,1} + C_{1,u\sharp}, B_{v\heartsuit,2} + C_{2,u\sharp}\} = 10u + 10v - 10$, from item 1 of Definition 3.7 that $A_{v\heartsuit,u\sharp} = \min\{10(u + v) - 10, \gamma_u, \rho_v\}$, so (3.6) holds again.

Items 6.1–6.5 consider all the possibilities, so the consideration of case 6 is complete. The cases 1–6 prove (3.5) for every $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}$, so we can conclude that indeed $B \otimes C = A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$. □

3.3. The main results.

In this subsection, we finalize the proof of the fact that k-TMF is NP-hard for $k \geq 8$. What we need is the following lemma.

Lemma 3.11. *Let an input $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ be such that the answer in Problem 3.2 is 'no', assume $B \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{|\mathcal{I}|\times 8}$, $C \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{8\times|\mathcal{J}|}$. Then $B \otimes C \neq A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$.*

Proof. The proof is by *reductio ad absurdum.* We assume that $B \otimes C = A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, in other words, that the equality

$$A_{ij} = \min_{\tau=1}^{8}\{B_{i\tau} + C_{\tau j}\} \tag{3.7}$$

holds for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$.

Step 1.

1.1. Let $\tau' \in \{1,\ldots,8\}$ satisfy $C_{\tau'\psi} \neq \infty$ for some $\psi \in \{1\natural,\ldots,7\natural\}$. From Definition 3.7 it follows that $A_{8\spadesuit,\psi} = A_{9\spadesuit,\psi} = \infty$, so the equality (3.7) implies $B_{8\spadesuit,\tau'} + C_{\tau'\psi} = B_{9\spadesuit,\tau'} + C_{\tau'\psi} = \infty$, and thus we have $B_{8\spadesuit,\tau'} = B_{9\spadesuit,\tau'} = \infty$.

1.2. By $\overline{\tau} = \{\overline{\tau}_1,\ldots,\overline{\tau}_g\}$ we denote the set of all $\tau \in \{1,\ldots,8\}$ satisfying both $\min\{C_{\tau,9\natural}, C_{\tau,10\natural}\} \neq \infty$ and $C_{\tau,1\natural} = \ldots = C_{\tau,7\natural} = \infty$. From item 1.1 it follows that either $B_{8\spadesuit,\tau''} = B_{9\spadesuit,\tau''} = \infty$ or $C_{\tau'',9\natural} = C_{\tau'',10\natural} = \infty$ for every $\tau'' \notin \overline{\tau}$. Thus the equality (3.7) implies that

$$A[8\spadesuit, 9\spadesuit|9\natural, 10\natural] = B[8\spadesuit, 9\spadesuit|\overline{\tau}_1,\ldots,\overline{\tau}_g] \otimes C[\overline{\tau}_1,\ldots,\overline{\tau}_g|9\natural, 10\natural],$$

and, since from Definition 3.7 it follows that $A[8\spadesuit, 9\spadesuit|9\natural, 10\natural] = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \infty \\ \infty & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, we see that $\overline{\tau}$ has cardinality at least 2.

1.3. Using item 1.2, we assume without a loss of generality that $7, 8 \in \overline{\tau}$. Thus,

$$\min\{C_{7,9\natural}, C_{7,10\natural}\} \neq \infty, \quad \min\{C_{8,9\natural}, C_{8,10\natural}\} \neq \infty, \tag{3.8}$$

$$C_{7\psi} = C_{8\psi} = \infty \quad \text{for} \quad \psi \in \{1\natural,\ldots,7\natural\}. \tag{3.9}$$

Step 2. From the equality (3.7) it follows that the condition

$$\min\{A_{s',9\natural}, A_{s',10\natural}\} = \min_{\tau=1}^{8} \{B_{s',\tau} + \min\{C_{\tau,9\natural}, C_{\tau,10\natural}\}\} \tag{3.10}$$

holds, in particular, for every $s' \in \{1\spadesuit,\ldots,7\spadesuit, 1\heartsuit,\ldots,(\sigma-m)\heartsuit\}$.

By Definition 3.7, we have $A_{s',9\natural} = A_{s',10\natural} = \infty$, so that the left-hand side of (3.10) is indeed equal to ∞. Now from the conditions (3.8) it follows that

$$B_{s'7} = B_{s'8} = \infty \quad \text{for} \quad s' \in \{1\spadesuit,\ldots,7\spadesuit, 1\heartsuit,\ldots,(\sigma-m)\heartsuit\}. \tag{3.11}$$

Step 3. Note that the product $B \otimes C$ will remain unchanged if we add some number $r \in \mathbb{R}$ to every entry of the τth column of B and $-r$ to every entry of the τth row of C. So we can assume without a loss of generality that for $t \in \{1,\ldots,6\}$, the tth row of C either consists of ∞'s or has 0 as its minimal element.

3.1. If the tth row of C consists of ∞'s, then, analogously, we can add a sufficiently large number to every entry of the tth column of B without changing the product $B \otimes C$. Thus it can be assumed without a loss of generality that in this case, the tth column of B consists of positive elements.

3.2. Now assume that the tth row of C has 0 as its minimal element (namely, $C_{tg'} = 0$ for some $g' \in \mathcal{J}$) and that $B_{s't} < 0$ for some $s' \in \{1\spadesuit,\ldots,7\spadesuit, 1\heartsuit,\ldots,(\sigma-m)\heartsuit\}$. Then from the equality (3.7) it follows that $A_{s'g'} \leq B_{s't} + C_{tg'} < 0$, a contradiction with Definition 3.7.

As a conclusion of Step 3, we therefore obtain that $B_{s't} \geq 0$, $C_{tj} \geq 0$ for all $s' \in \{1\spadesuit,\ldots,7\spadesuit, 1\heartsuit,\ldots,(\sigma-m)\heartsuit\}$, $t \in \{1,\ldots,6\}$, and $j \in \mathcal{J}$.

Step 4. Fix arbitrary $u \in \{1,\ldots,\sigma\}$ and $v \in \{1,\ldots,\sigma-m\}$.

The condition (3.11) implies that $\min_{t=1}^{6}\{B_{s't} + C_{tj}\} = \min_{\tau=1}^{8}\{B_{s'\tau} + C_{\tau j}\}$ for $s' \in \{1\spadesuit,\ldots,7\spadesuit, 1\heartsuit,\ldots,(\sigma-m)\heartsuit\}$. In particular, this means that the product of matrices $\widehat{B} = B[1\spadesuit,\ldots,7\spadesuit, v\heartsuit|1,\ldots,6]$ and $\widehat{C} = C[1,\ldots,6|1\natural,\ldots,8\natural, u\sharp]$ is equal to the matrix $A[1\spadesuit,\ldots,7\spadesuit,v\heartsuit|1\natural,\ldots,8\natural,u\sharp]$. By Definition 3.7, we have that

$$\widehat{B}\otimes\widehat{C}=\begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & * & 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ * & 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & 0 & * & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * & * & * & * & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & * & 0 & * & 0 & * \\ * & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & 0 & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & 0 & * & * \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.12}$$

where the asterisks stand for certain (possibly different) positive elements from $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$. By the conclusion of Step 3, the matrices $\widehat{B}$ and $\widehat{C}$ consist of nonnegative elements. Then, it turns out that the equality (3.12) determines the 'zero patterns' of $\widehat{B}$ and $\widehat{C}$ uniquely up to a permutation of row and column indexes. Namely, one can check that

$$B[1\spadesuit,\ldots,7\spadesuit,v\heartsuit|\omega(1),\ldots,\omega(6)]=\begin{pmatrix} * & * & 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & 0 & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & * & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.13}$$

$$C[\omega(1),\ldots,\omega(6)|1\natural,\ldots,8\natural,u\sharp]=\begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & 0 & * & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ * & 0 & * & 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * & * & * & * & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & * & 0 & * & 0 & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & 0 & * & * \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.14}$$

where the asterisks stand again for certain positive elements from $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, and ω for some permutation on $\{1,\ldots,6\}$. Note that performing the same permutation of column indexes of B and row indexes of C will not change the product $B\otimes C$. Thus we can assume without a loss of generality that ω is the identity permutation.

Step 5. Fix arbitrary $\eta\in\{1,\ldots,n\}$ and $h\in\{2,3,4,5\}$.

5.1. From Definition 3.7 it follows that $A_{\eta\diamondsuit,h\natural}=0$.

5.2. The condition (3.9) shows that $C_{7,h\natural}=C_{8,h\natural}=\infty$.

Further, assume that $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,t'}+C_{t',h\natural}\leq 0$ for some $t'\in\{4,5,6\}$; then from (3.14) it follows that $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,t'}<0$. In this case, we use (3.14) again and obtain that $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,4}+C_{4,1\natural}<0$, or $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,5}+C_{5,6\natural}<0$, or else $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,6}+C_{6,7\natural}<0$. On the other hand, Definition 3.7 implies $A_{\eta\diamondsuit,1\natural}=A_{\eta\diamondsuit,6\natural}=A_{\eta\diamondsuit,7\natural}=2$, so we get a contradiction with the equality (3.7). Thus we have $\min_{t''=4}^{8}\{B_{\eta\diamondsuit,t''}+C_{t'',h\natural}\}>0$.

5.3. Items 5.1 and 5.2 and the equality (3.7) show that $\min_{t=1}^{3}\{B_{\eta\diamondsuit,t}+C_{t,h\natural}\}=0$. From the equality (3.14) it then follows that

$$B_{\eta\diamondsuit,3}=0 \quad \text{for} \quad \eta\in\{1,\ldots,n\}, \tag{3.15}$$

and $\min\{B_{\eta\diamondsuit,1},B_{\eta\diamondsuit,2}\}=0$.

5.4. By Ψ_1 (respectively, Ψ_2) we denote the set of all η satisfying $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,1} = 0$ (respectively, $B_{\eta\diamondsuit,2} = 0$); from item 5.3 it follows that $\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2 = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. The initial assumption of the lemma states that, given the input $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, the answer in Problem 3.2 is 'no'. Therefore, for some $\mu \in \{0, \ldots, m-1\}$ and $\chi \in \{1, 2\}$, we have

$$\{\sigma_\mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1}\} \subset \bigcup_{i \in \Psi_\chi} \mathcal{R}_i. \tag{3.16}$$

5.5. The condition (3.16) means that for every $u' \in \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1}\}$, there exists $\eta(u') \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ for which $u' \in \mathcal{R}_{\eta(u')}$ and $\eta(u') \in \Psi_\chi$. (Here and in the rest of the proof, μ and χ denote the indexes defined in item 5.4.) Item 2 of Definition 3.7 then shows that $A_{\eta(u')\diamondsuit,u'\sharp} = \gamma_{u'}$, the definition of Ψ_χ that $B_{\eta(u')\diamondsuit,\chi} = 0$. The number $\gamma_{u'}$ is to be understood here with respect to (3.1), namely, for our case, we have that

$$\gamma_{u'} = 20u' - 10\mu - 9 \text{ if } u' \neq \sigma_{\mu+1}, \quad \text{and } \gamma_{\sigma_{\mu+1}} = 20\sigma_{\mu+1} - 10\mu - 19. \tag{3.17}$$

5.6. The equality (3.7) shows that $B_{\eta(u')\diamondsuit,\chi} + C_{\chi,u'\sharp} \geq A_{\eta(u')\diamondsuit,u'\sharp}$; item 5.5 therefore implies

$$C_{\chi,u'\sharp} \geq \gamma_{u'} \quad \text{for every} \quad u' \in \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1}\}. \tag{3.18}$$

Step 6.

6.1. From Definition 3.7 it follows that $A_{6\spadesuit,\sigma\sharp} = 10\sigma - 3$, so the equality (3.7) implies $B_{6\spadesuit,4} + C_{4,\sigma\sharp} \geq 10\sigma - 3$. By (3.14), it holds that $C_{4,\sigma\sharp} = 0$, so we obtain

$$B_{6\spadesuit,4} \geq 10\sigma - 3. \tag{3.19}$$

6.2. From Definition 3.7 it also follows that $A_{7\spadesuit,u'\sharp} = \gamma_{u'}$ for $u' \in \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1}\}$. The equality (3.7) therefore implies $B_{7\spadesuit,6} + C_{6,u'\sharp} \geq \gamma_{u'}$. By (3.13), it holds that $B_{7\spadesuit,6} = 0$, so we have

$$C_{6,u'\sharp} \geq \gamma_{u'} \quad \text{for every} \quad u' \in \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1}\}. \tag{3.20}$$

6.3. Again, Definition 3.7 implies that for every $u' \in \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1}\}$, we have $A_{\nu(u')\diamondsuit,u'\sharp} = \gamma_{u'}$ (where the function ν is defined with respect to Remark 3.5). Therefore, by the equality (3.7), we obtain $B_{\nu(u')\diamondsuit,3} + C_{3,u'\sharp} \geq \gamma_{u'}$. By (3.15), it holds that $B_{\nu(u')\diamondsuit,3} = 0$, thus,

$$C_{3,u'\sharp} \geq \gamma_{u'} \quad \text{for every} \quad u' \in \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1}\}. \tag{3.21}$$

6.4. We use Definition 3.7 again and obtain $A_{v'\heartsuit,8\natural} = \rho_{v'}$ for every $v' \in \{\sigma_\mu - \mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1} - \mu - 1\}$; the number $\rho_{v'}$ is to be understood here with respect to (3.1), namely,

$$\rho_{v'} = 20v' + 10\mu + 1. \tag{3.22}$$

Therefore, by the equality (3.7), we obtain $B_{v'\heartsuit,4} + C_{4,8\natural} \geq \rho_{v'}$, $B_{v'\heartsuit,5} + C_{5,8\natural} \geq \rho_{v'}$. By (3.14), it holds that $C_{4,8\natural} = C_{5,8\natural} = 0$, thus,

$$B_{v'\heartsuit,4} \geq \rho_{v'}, \; B_{v'\heartsuit,5} \geq \rho_{v'} \quad \text{for every} \quad v' \in \{\sigma_\mu - \mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1} - \mu - 1\}. \tag{3.23}$$

6.5. We have $A_{5\spadesuit,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} = 10\sigma_\mu + 11$ by Definition 3.7. Therefore, by the equality (3.7), we obtain $B_{5\spadesuit,5} + C_{5,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} \geq 10\sigma_\mu + 11$. By the equality (3.13), it holds that $B_{5\spadesuit,5} = 0$, thus,

$$C_{5,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} \geq 10\sigma_\mu + 11. \tag{3.24}$$

Step 7.

7.1. We have $A_{6\spadesuit,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} = 10\sigma_\mu + 7$ by Definition 3.7.

7.2. The conditions (3.18), (3.20), (3.21), and (3.24) show that $C_{\widehat{t},(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} > 10\sigma_\mu + 7$ for $\widehat{t} \in \{\chi, 3, 5, 6\}$; the conclusion of Step 3 that $B_{6\spadesuit,\widehat{t}} \geq 0$, thus we have

$$B_{6\spadesuit,\widehat{t}} + C_{\widehat{t},(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} > A_{6\spadesuit,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp}. \tag{3.25}$$

7.3. By (3.19), $B_{6\spadesuit,4} \geq 10\sigma - 3$. From Remark 3.4 it follows that $\sigma - \sigma_\mu \geq 2$, so we obtain $B_{6\spadesuit,4} > 10\sigma_\mu + 7$. The equality (3.14) implies $C_{4,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} = 0$, so that

$$B_{6\spadesuit,4} + C_{4,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} > A_{6\spadesuit,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp}. \tag{3.26}$$

7.4. From (3.11) it follows that, finally,

$$B_{6\spadesuit,7} + C_{7,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} = B_{6\spadesuit,8} + C_{8,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} = \infty. \tag{3.27}$$

7.5. The conditions (3.25)–(3.27) show that the minimum in (3.7) for $i = 6\spadesuit$, $j = (\sigma_\mu + 1)\sharp$ is provided by $\tau = \varphi$ (where φ stands for the index from $\{1, 2\}$ not equal to χ, that is, $\{\varphi\} = \{1, 2\} \setminus \{\chi\}$). So, using item 7.1, we see that

$$B_{6\spadesuit,\varphi} + C_{\varphi,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} = 10\sigma_\mu + 7;$$

by (3.13), $B_{6\spadesuit,\varphi} = 0$, thus,

$$C_{\varphi,(\sigma_\mu+1)\sharp} = 10\sigma_\mu + 7. \tag{3.28}$$

Step 8. Now we consider indexes $\overline{u} \in \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1}\}$ and $\overline{v} \in \{\sigma_\mu - \mu + 1, \ldots, \sigma_{\mu+1} - \mu - 1\}$ that satisfy the condition either $\overline{v} = \overline{u} - \mu - 1$ or $\overline{v} = \overline{u} - \mu$.

8.1. Definition 3.7 shows that $A_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\overline{u}\sharp} = 10\overline{u} + 10\overline{v} - 10$ if $\overline{u} \neq \sigma_{\mu+1}$, and

$$A_{(\sigma_{\mu+1}-\mu-1)\heartsuit,\sigma_{\mu+1}\sharp} = 20\sigma_{\mu+1} - 10\mu - 21.$$

8.2. Step 3 shows that $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,t} \geq 0$ and $C_{t,\overline{u}\sharp} \geq 0$ for $t \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, the condition (3.11) that $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,7} = B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,8} = \infty$.

8.3. The condition (3.23) shows that $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,4} \geq \rho_{\overline{v}}$, $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,5} \geq \rho_{\overline{v}}$. Using item 8.1 and the equality (3.22), we obtain $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,4} > A_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\overline{u}\sharp}$, $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,5} > A_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\overline{u}\sharp}$. Further, the conditions (3.18), (3.20), and (3.21) imply that the elements $C_{\chi,\overline{u}\sharp}$, $C_{3,\overline{u}\sharp}$, and $C_{6,\overline{u}\sharp}$ are all greater than or equal to $\gamma_{\overline{u}}$. Item 8.1 and the equation (3.17) show therefore that $C_{\chi,\overline{u}\sharp}$, $C_{3,\overline{u}\sharp}$, and $C_{6,\overline{u}\sharp}$ are greater than $A_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\overline{u}\sharp}$.

8.4. Items 8.2 and 8.3 show that $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,t} + C_{t,\overline{u}\sharp} > A_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\overline{u}\sharp}$ whenever $t \in \{\chi, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$. The equality (3.7) thus shows that $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\varphi} + C_{\varphi,\overline{u}\sharp} = A_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\overline{u}\sharp}$, and, therefore,

$$B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\varphi} + C_{\varphi,\overline{u}\sharp} = 10\overline{u} + 10\overline{v} - 10 \quad \text{for} \quad \overline{u} \neq \sigma_{\mu+1}, \quad \text{and} \tag{3.29}$$

$$C_{\varphi,\sigma_{\mu+1}\sharp} = 20\sigma_{\mu+1} - 10\mu - 21 - B_{(\sigma_{\mu+1}-\mu-1)\heartsuit,\varphi}. \tag{3.30}$$

8.5. By the initial setting of Step 8, $\overline{v}$ can be either $\overline{u} - \mu$ or $\overline{u} - \mu - 1$ if $\overline{u} \notin \{\sigma_\mu + 1, \sigma_{\mu+1}\}$, and $\overline{v} = \sigma_\mu - \mu + 1$ if $\overline{u} = \sigma_\mu + 1$ in (3.29). Therefore, the conditions (3.29) together with (3.28) and (3.30) form a classical linear system with $2(\sigma_{\mu+1} - \sigma_\mu) - 1$ real unknowns and with the same number of equations; the system has a unique solution and it is given by $B_{\overline{v}\heartsuit,\varphi} = 10\overline{v} - 7$, $C_{\varphi,\overline{u}\sharp} = 10\overline{u} - 3$ for $\overline{u} \neq \sigma_{\mu+1}$, and

$$C_{\varphi,\sigma_{\mu+1}\sharp} = 10\sigma_{\mu+1} - 4. \tag{3.31}$$

8.6. Finally, we note that $B_{6\spadesuit,\varphi} = 0$ by the equality (3.13), so the equality (3.31) implies $B_{6\spadesuit,\varphi} + C_{\varphi,\sigma_{\mu+1}\sharp} = 10\sigma_{\mu+1} - 4$. Now we use the equality (3.7) to derive that $A_{6\spadesuit,\sigma_{\mu+1}\sharp} \leq 10\sigma_{\mu+1} - 4$ and obtain a contradiction with Definition 3.7 with respect to which $A_{6\spadesuit,\sigma_{\mu+1}\sharp} = 10\sigma_{\mu+1} - 3$.

The contradiction obtained shows that the initial assumption was false. Therefore, matrices $B \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{|\mathcal{I}|\times 8}$ and $C \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{8\times|\mathcal{J}|}$ can not satisfy $B \otimes C = A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$. □

Now we are ready to prove the main results of the present section.

Theorem 3.12. *The k-TMF problem is NP-complete for any integer $k \geq 8$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11, the matrix $A(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ has factor rank at most 8 if and only if Problem 3.2 returns a positive answer on the query $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$. Using Proposition 2.6, we construct the matrix $\mathcal{A}(\Sigma, \mathcal{R}, k)$, which has factor rank at most k if and only if Problem 3.2 returns a positive answer. By Lemma 3.8, the number of operations needed to construct $\mathcal{A}(\Sigma, \mathcal{R}, k)$ is polynomial in the size of the data. Finally, we perform an appropriate scaling and apply Lemma 2.5, thus giving a polynomial transformation from Problem 3.2 to k-TMF. That k-TMF is in NP follows from Theorem 2.4. □

Theorem 3.12 allows us to obtain a negative answer for Question 1.2.

Corollary 3.13. *It is an NP-hard problem to decide whether the factor rank of a given tropical matrix equals* 8.

Proof. In order to check whether the factor rank is at most 8, we need to solve the 8-TMF problem. So the result follows from Theorem 3.12. □

Another result that can be obtained as a corollary of Theorem 3.12 gives an answer for Question 1.5. In contrast with the situation of the Gondran–Minoux rank, which can be computed in polynomial time if a given matrix has bounded tropical rank [18], Question 1.5 is answered in the negative.

Theorem 3.14. *Given a matrix A of tropical rank at most* 8*, it is NP-hard to decide whether the factor rank of A is at most* 8.

Proof. Using the definition of tropical rank explicitly, one can check in time $O(m^9 n^9)$ whether the tropical rank of an m-by-n matrix is greater than 8. Further, Theorem 1.4 of [15] shows that the factor rank of a matrix is greater than 8 if the tropical rank is. Thus the present theorem follows from Theorem 3.12. □

4. When TMF is easy: the case $k \leq 3$

In this section, we discuss the computational complexity of tropical matrix factorization in the case when the dimension k is small. It turns out that the TMF problem admits an easy solution if k is required to be small enough, indeed, the case of $k = 1$ is trivial. In [15], the authors show that every tropical matrix whose factor rank is greater than 2 has a 3-by-3 submatrix with full factor rank, thus giving a polynomial-time algorithm for solving TMF in the case $k \leq 2$. In fact, the TMF problem with $k \leq 2$ can be solved by a linear-time algorithm, see [10, 15]. However, the question of whether the TMF problem can be solved in polynomial time in the case $k = 3$ remained open. The goal of this section is to give an affirmative answer to this question.

The proof of the main result of this section is based on a reduction to a problem of linear programming. In the most general setting, the problem of *linear programming* asks whether a given system of m linear inequalities with n real unknowns has a solution. The polynomial-time algorithm for this problem has been constructed by Khachiyan in [27]. However, the number of operations that Khachiyan's algorithm needs to perform depends on the magnitude of coefficients, and this number can be unbounded even if m and n are fixed [30]. On the other hand, it turns out that in our case, it is sufficient to consider the following special case of linear programming.

Problem 4.1. Given a system of m linear inequalities involving n real unknowns but no more than two unknowns per inequality.

Question: Does there exist a solution of the given system?

In contrast with the general problem of linear programming, a *strongly-polynomial* algorithm is known for solving Problem 4.1. In other words, the number of operations this algorithm requires is bounded by a polynomial of m and n.

Theorem 4.2. [30] *There is an algorithm that solves Problem 4.1 and requires at most* $O\left(mn^3 \log m\right)$ *arithmetic operations.*

In order to prove our main result, we also need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let* r_i *be the greatest element of the* i*th row of a matrix* $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$, *and* c_j *the greatest element of the* j*th column. If numbers* u_i *and* v_j *satisfy* $\min\{u_i, v_j\} = A_{ij}$ *for any pair of indexes, then either* $u_i = r_i$ *for every* i *or* $v_j = c_j$ *for every* j.

Proof. If $u_{i'} < r_{i'}$ for some i', then we have $A_{i'j} < r_{i'}$ for every j, thus obtaining a contradiction with the maximality of $r_{i'}$. So we see that $u_i \geq r_i$ for every i. Analogously, we can show that $v_j \geq c_j$ for every j.

Finally, if we have $u_i > r_i$ and $v_j > c_j$ for some i and j, then A_{ij} is greater than $\min\{r_i, c_j\}$, again contradicting the maximality of r_i and c_j. □

Now we will prove the main result of this section. Throughout the proof, when we say that a certain computation can be made in time $\varphi(m, n)$, we mean that the computation requires at most $\varphi(m, n)$ arithmetic operations in the worst case.

Theorem 4.4. *Given a matrix* $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. *There is an algorithm that decides whether the factor rank of* A *is greater than* 3 *and requires at most* $O\left((m+n)^3 mn \log(mn) + m^3n^3\right)$ *arithmetic operations in the worst case.*

Proof. We need to decide whether the system of equations

$$\min_{\tau=1}^{3}\{B_{i\tau} + C_{\tau j}\} = A_{ij} \tag{4.1}$$

has a solution $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 3}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times n}$.

1. Proposition 6.1 from [15] states that A has factor rank at least 3 if and only if there is a full-rank 3-by-3 submatrix of A. The 3-by-3 submatrices of A can be treated in time $O(m^3n^3)$, so we can assume without a loss of generality that $A[1,2,3|1,2,3]$ has factor rank 3. Then we perform an appropriate scaling and relabeling, and can therefore assume that 0 is the minimal element of every row and every column of A, and that $A[1,2,3|1,2,3]$ equals either

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & * \\ * & 0 & * \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.2}$$

where the asterisks stand for certain (possibly different) positive numbers.

2. Assume that the jth column of A consists of zero elements. In this case, we check whether $\min\{A_{i1}, A_{i2}, A_{i3}\} = 0$ for every i. If so, the jth column of A is a tropical sum of the first three columns, and we can remove the jth column without changing the factor rank. Otherwise, if $\min\{A_{i1}, A_{i2}, A_{i3}\} > 0$ for some i, then the submatrix $A[1, 2, 3, i|1, 2, 3, j]$ equals either

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & * & 0 \\ * & 0 & * & 0 \\ * & * & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * & 0 \\ * & * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

so the factor rank of A is at least 4. Note that zero columns can be straightforwardly detected in time $O(mn)$. We can therefore assume that no column (as well as no row, analogously) of A consists of zero entries.

3. Suppose that matrices B and C indeed satisfy (4.1). Then for every $\tau \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we subtract b_τ, the least element of the τth column of B, from every entry of that column and add b_τ to every entry of the τth row of C. The matrices B' and C' obtained satisfy $B' \otimes C' = A$, and the minimal element of every column of B' equals 0. From item 1 it then follows that every element of C' is nonnegative as well. Thus we can assume without a loss of generality that

$$B_{i\tau} \geq 0,\ \ C_{\tau j} \geq 0 \tag{4.3}$$

for every triple of indexes i, j, τ. It is thus sufficient to decide whether there exist matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 3}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times n}$ that satisfy (4.1) and (4.3) simultaneously. Let us start to describe the algorithm that makes this decision.

4. Items 1 and 3 allow us to determine the 'zero patterns' of $B[1, 2, 3|1, 2, 3]$ and $C[1, 2, 3|1, 2, 3]$ up to relabeling the columns of B and relabeling the rows of C. Namely, the problem reduces to the following three cases, each of which can be treated by the algorithm separately:

$$B[1,2,3|1,2,3] = C[1,2,3|1,2,3] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & * \\ * & 0 & * \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$B[1,2,3|1,2,3] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & * \\ * & 0 & * \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix},\ C[1,2,3|1,2,3] = \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$B[1,2,3|1,2,3] = \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{pmatrix},\ C[1,2,3|1,2,3] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & * \\ * & 0 & * \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.6}$$

If $B[1, 2, 3|1, 2, 3]$ has the form as in (4.4), then, by (4.1), we necessarily have $C_{\tau j} = 0$ if $A_{\tau j} = 0$ and $C_{\tau j} > 0$ if $A_{\tau j} > 0$ for every $\tau \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Further, if $C[1, 2, 3|1, 2, 3]$ has the form as in (4.4), then (4.1) implies that $B_{i\tau} = 0$ if $A_{i\tau} = 0$ and $B_{i\tau} > 0$ if $A_{i\tau} > 0$ for every $\tau \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

Now consider the case (4.5), then the sign of every entry of C is determined uniquely by the considerations of the previous paragraph. From item 2 it follows that for every i, there exists $j = j(i)$ satisfying $A_{i,j(i)} > 0$. If $j(i) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then we use (4.1) to obtain that $B_{i\tau} = 0$ if $C_{\tau,j(i)} > 0$ and $B_{i\tau} > 0$ if $C_{\tau,j(i)} = 0$. Otherwise, if $A_{i1} = A_{i2} = A_{i3} = 0$, then we have $j(i) > 3$, and from (4.1) it can be deduced that again $B_{i\tau} = 0$ if $C_{\tau,j(i)} > 0$ and $B_{i\tau} > 0$ if $C_{\tau,j(i)} = 0$.

Thus we have determined how the 'zero patterns' of B and C look like in the cases (4.4) and (4.5), and we have performed $O(mn)$ operations to do this. The case (4.6) can be considered in the same way as (4.5).

5. Let A_{ij} equal β_j, the greatest element of the jth column of A. By item 4, we know a $\tau(j) \in \{1,2,3\}$ for which $B_{i,\tau(j)} = 0$, the equations (4.1) then imply that $C_{\tau(j),j} \geq \beta_j$. Moreover, if the equations (4.1) and (4.3) are satisfied by some B and C, then they can not be then broken by setting $C_{\tau(j),j} = \beta_j$. Note that computations of item 5 also require at most $O(mn)$ operations.

6. Thus for every j, we can assume without a loss of generality that we have yet computed the values $C_{\tau_1(j),j} = 0$, $C_{\tau_2(j),j} = \beta_j$, where $\tau_1(j), \tau_2(j) \in \{1,2,3\}$. Analogously, for every i, it be can assumed that $B_{i,\tau'_1(i)} = 0$, $B_{i,\tau'_2(i)} = \gamma_i$ for $\tau'_1(i), \tau'_2(i) \in \{1,2,3\}$ (γ_i stands here for the greatest element of the ith row of A). Note that the numbers $\tau_1(j)$ and $\tau'_1(i)$ are determined by the computations of item 4, the numbers $\tau_2(j)$ and $\tau'_2(i)$ by the computations of item 5. Note that by item 2, $\beta_j \neq 0$ and $\gamma_i \neq 0$ for every i and j, so that $\tau_1(j) \neq \tau_2(j)$ and $\tau'_1(i) \neq \tau'_2(i)$. We also denote $\{\tau_3(j)\} = \{1,2,3\} \setminus \{\tau_1(j), \tau_2(j)\}$ and $\{\tau'_3(i)\} = \{1,2,3\} \setminus \{\tau'_1(i), \tau'_2(i)\}$.

7. Let t_1, t_2, t_3 be different elements from $\{1,2,3\}$. By $\mathcal{I}_{t_1,t_2}$ we denote the set of all i satisfying $\tau'_1(i) = t_1$, $\tau'_2(i) = t_2$; by $\mathcal{J}_{t_1,t_2}$ denote the set of all j satisfying $\tau_1(j) = t_1$, $\tau_2(j) = t_2$.

Consider the subsystem of the system (4.1) formed by the equations with $i \in \mathcal{I}_{1,2}$, $j \in \mathcal{J}_{3,2}$. We can now apply Lemma 4.3 and reduce our problem to the two cases, each of which can be treated separately. In one of these cases, the value of B_{i3} is determined for every $i \in \mathcal{I}_{1,2}$; in the other of them, C_{1j} is determined for every $j \in \mathcal{J}_{3,2}$.

We repeat our considerations with arbitrary $\mathcal{I}_{t_1,t_2}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{t_3,t_2}$ instead of $\mathcal{I}_{1,2}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{3,2}$, the algorithm needs then consider $2^6 = 64$ cases separately. In what follows, we can therefore assume that, if $\tau'_2(i) = \tau_2(j)$ and $\tau'_1(i) \neq \tau_1(j)$, then either $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)}$ or $C_{\tau_3(j),j}$ is yet known. Finally, we note that the computations of item 7 can also be performed in time $O(mn)$.

8. Now we will prove that for every i and j, the equation (4.1) either gives a contradiction or is equivalent to a linear inequality or equation with at most 2 unknowns. This will reduce our problem to Problem 4.1, and then we will complete our proof by applying Theorem 4.2.

Indeed, let $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$, $j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$. If the entry $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)}$ is known, then (4.1) is either a contradiction or can be rewritten as either $B_{i,\tau_3(j)} + C_{\tau_3(j),j} = A_{ij}$ or $B_{i,\tau_3(j)} + C_{\tau_3(j),j} \geq A_{ij}$. The case when the entry $C_{\tau_3(j),j}$ is known can be treated in the same way. There are the four possibilities in the case when both $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)}$ and $C_{\tau_3(j),j}$ are unknown.

Case A. Suppose $\tau'_3(i) = \tau_3(j)$. In this case, if (4.1) is not a contradiction, then it can be rewritten as either $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)} + C_{\tau_3(j),j} = A_{ij}$ or $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)} + C_{\tau_3(j),j} \geq A_{ij}$.

Case B. Let $\tau'_3(i) = \tau_2(j)$. By item 4, we have $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)} > 0$, thus $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)} + C_{\tau'_3(i),j} > \beta_j \geq A_{ij}$. If (4.1) is not a contradiction, then it can be therefore rewritten as either $B_{i,\tau_3(j)} + C_{\tau_3(j),j} = A_{ij}$ or $B_{i,\tau_3(j)} + C_{\tau_3(j),j} \geq A_{ij}$.

Case C. Let $\tau'_2(i) = \tau_3(j)$. By item 4, we have $B_{i,\tau_3(j)} > 0$, thus $B_{i,\tau_3(j)} + C_{\tau_3(j),j} > \gamma_i \geq A_{ij}$. If (4.1) is not a contradiction, then it can be therefore rewritten as either $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)} + C_{\tau'_3(i),j} = A_{ij}$ or $B_{i,\tau'_3(i)} + C_{\tau'_3(i),j} \geq A_{ij}$.

Case D. The possibility $\tau'_2(i) = \tau_2(j)$, $\tau'_1(i) \neq \tau_1(j)$ is not indeed realizable thanks to item 7.

The cases A–D cover all the possibilities, so that for every indexes i and j, the equation (4.1) either gives a contradiction or is equivalent to a linear inequality or equation with at most 2 unknowns. What we need is to decide whether the systems (4.1) and (4.3) have a simultaneous solution, and this can be now done in time $O\left((m+n)^3 mn \log(mn)\right)$ by applying the algorithm mentioned in Theorem 4.2. $\square$

Theorem 4.4 shows that the TMF problem admits a polynomial-time solution in the case $k = 3$. We can now obtain a positive answer for Question 1.3.

Theorem 4.5. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that decides whether a given tropical matrix has factor rank* 3*.*

Proof. Checking whether the factor rank is at least 3 requires at most $O(m^3n^3)$ operations because it is sufficient to check whether some 3-by-3 submatrix has factor rank 3, see Proposition 6.1 from [15]. Checking whether the factor rank is at most 3 can be done in polynomial time as Theorem 4.4 shows. $\square$

We also prove the result on the complexity of the 3-TMF problem.

Theorem 4.6. *The* 3*-TMF problem belongs to the class P.*

Proof. Solving 3-TMF means deciding whether a given matrix has factor rank at most 3. So the result follows from Theorem 4.4. $\square$

The k-TMF problem, which belongs to NP by Theorem 2.4, is still not known to be either in P or NP-complete if $k \in \{4, 5, 6, 7\}$. For these values of k, the question of whether k-TMF admits a polynomial-time solution seems to be an interesting topic for future research.

5. Factor rank and minors of fixed size

In this section, we discuss a problem that is related to determining computational complexity of tropical matrix factorization. The problem we are interested in, Question 1.4 of the present paper, has been formulated by Develin, Santos, and Sturmfels in [15]. The question asks to find some $N = N(k)$ for which every matrix with rank greater than k necessarily contains a submatrix whose rank is greater than k and whose size is at most $N \times N$. For instance, the basic result of classical linear algebra states that we can set $N_{\mathbb{F}}(k) = k + 1$ for usual rank function of matrices over a field. Also, it follows directly from the definition that for tropical rank of a tropical matrix, one can set $N_{\mathrm{tr}}(k) = k + 1$. The same question has also been studied for the Gondran–Minoux rank functions of tropical matrices, and it has been proved that setting $N_{\mathrm{GM}}(k) = 2^{k+1}$ is sufficient in that case [18].

For the factor rank, it is trivial that we can set $N(0) = 1$, and it is easy to check that setting $N(1) = 2$ suffices. The fact that $N(2)$ can be set to equal 3 has been proved in [15]. It was not known, however, whether there exists an $N(k)$ if $k \geq 3$. If there were such $N(k)$, it would be bounded below by a function having an exponential growth as k approaches infinity, see Proposition 2.2 of [15]. In this section, we construct an example showing that indeed no such $N(k)$ exists for $k \geq 4$.

We fix an arbitrary integer $\nu > 1$ and will use its designation throughout this section. Our goal is to construct a matrix C with the following properties: (i) every minor of C of size at most $\nu \times \nu$ has factor rank at most 4, (ii) the factor rank of C itself is greater than 4. Now we present an example of such a matrix.

Example 5.1. *Denote an arbitrary number from* $\{1,\ldots,\nu+1\}$ *by* u, *from* $\{1,\ldots,\nu+2\}$ *by* v. *The entries of the tropical matrix* $C=C(\nu)\in\mathbb{R}^{(\nu+6)\times(\nu+6)}$ *are defined as follows:*

(1) $C_{uv}=\min\{10u+10v-10, 20u+1, 20v-9\}$ *if* (u,v) *equals neither* $(\nu,\nu{+}1)$ *nor* $(\nu+1,\nu+1)$*;*

(2) $C_{\nu,\nu+1}=20\nu-1$*;* $C_{\nu+1,\nu+1}=20\nu+11$*;*

(3) $C_{u,\nu+3}=0$, $C_{u,\nu+4}=C_{u,\nu+5}=C_{u,\nu+6}=2$*;*

(4) $C_{\nu+2,u}=10u-3$, $C_{\nu+3,u}=11$, $C_{\nu+4,u}=C_{\nu+5,u}=2$, $C_{\nu+6,u}=0$*;*

(5) the matrix $C[\nu+2,\ldots,\nu+6|\nu+2,\ldots,\nu+6]$ *equals*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2\\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2\\ 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2\\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2\\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us prove that the factor rank of the matrix introduced is at least 5.

Theorem 5.2. *The factor rank of the matrix* $C(\nu)$ *is greater than* 4.

Proof. Assume the converse. Definition 1.1 then implies that $C=A\otimes B$ for some $A\in\mathbb{R}^{(\nu+6)\times 4}$ and $B\in\mathbb{R}^{4\times(\nu+6)}$, that is,

$$\min_{q=1}^{4}\{A_{sq}+B_{qt}\}=C_{st} \tag{5.1}$$

for every $s,t\in\{1,\ldots,\nu+6\}$.

1. Note that the product $A\otimes B$ will remain unchanged if we add some number $r\in\mathbb{R}$ to every entry of the qth column of A and $-r$ to every entry of the qth row of B. So we can assume without a loss of generality that for every $q\in\{1,2,3,4\}$, the qth row of B has 0 as its minimal element. In this case, the matrix A also consists of nonnegative elements, because from Example 5.1 it follows that the elements of $C=A\otimes B$ are nonnegative.

2. Let us denote by A' the 4-by-4 matrix formed by the rows of A with labels $\nu+1,\nu+4,\nu+5,\nu+6$, by B' the 4-by-4 matrix formed by the columns of B with numbers $\nu+3,\nu+4,\nu+5,\nu+6$. From the definition of the matrix C, which is equal to $A\otimes B$, it follows that the product $A'\otimes B'$ has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & * & *\\ * & 0 & * & *\\ * & * & 0 & *\\ * & * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.2}$$

where the asterisks stand for certain (possibly different) positive elements. Item 1 shows that A' and B' are nonnegative, so that the matrices A' and B' have the form (5.2) up to permutations of rows and columns. Note that performing the same permutation on column indexes of A and row indexes of B will not change the product $A\otimes B$. So we can assume without a loss of generality that the matrices A' and B' have exactly the form (5.2).

3. From item 1 it follows that the elements of A and B are nonnegative, from item 2 that $A_{\nu+5,q}=0$ if and only if $q=3$. So from (5.1) it follows that $B_{3t}=0$ if and only if $C_{\nu+5,t}=0$, where t is an arbitrary index from $\{1,\ldots,\nu+6\}$. Analogously, item 2 implies that $A_{\nu+6,q}=0$ if and only if $q=4$, so that the equation (5.1) shows that $B_{4t}=0$ if and only if $C_{\nu+6,t}=0$.

4. Item 2 also implies that $B_{q,\nu+3}=0$ if and only if $q=1$; $B_{q,\nu+4}=0$ if and only if $q=2$; $B_{q,\nu+5}=0$ if and only if $q=3$. Thus the equation (5.1) shows that $A_{s1}=0$ if and only if $C_{s,\nu+3}=0$; $A_{s2}=0$ if and only if $C_{s,\nu+4}=0$; $A_{s3}=0$ if and only if $C_{s,\nu+5}=0$; here s runs over $\{1,\ldots,\nu+6\}$.

5. In particular, items 3 and 4 imply that the entries $A_{\nu+1,1}$, $A_{\nu+3,1}$, $A_{\nu+2,2}$, $A_{\nu+3,3}$, $B_{3,\nu+2}$, $B_{4,\nu+1}$, $B_{4,\nu+2}$ are all equal to 0.

6. From (5.1) it also follows that $\min\{A_{s3}+B_{3,\nu+2},A_{s4}+B_{4,\nu+2}\}\geq C_{s,\nu+2}$ for every $s\in\{1,\ldots,\nu+6\}$. Item 5 implies that $B_{3,\nu+2}=B_{4,\nu+2}=0$, so we have $\min\{A_{s3},A_{s4}\}\geq C_{s,\nu+2}$. Applying the definition of the matrix C, we obtain $A_{i3}\geq 20i+1$, $A_{i4}\geq 20i+1$ for every $i\in\{1,\ldots,\nu\}$.

7. Analogously, from item 5 it follows that $A_{\nu+1,1}=0$, so (5.1) implies that $B_{1t}\geq C_{\nu+1,t}$ for every $t\in\{1,\ldots,\nu+6\}$. For $j\in\{1,\ldots,\nu+1\}$, we therefore obtain $B_{1j}\geq 20j-9$.

8. Again, item 5 implies $B_{4,\nu+1}=0$, so (5.1) shows that $A_{\nu+2,4}\geq C_{\nu+2,\nu+1}=10\nu+7$. Further, by item 5, $A_{\nu+3,1}=A_{\nu+3,3}=0$, so (5.1) implies $\min\{B_{11},B_{31}\}\geq C_{\nu+3,1}$, that is, $B_{11}\geq 11$, $B_{31}\geq 11$.

9. Item 8 shows that the number $A_{\nu+2,q}+B_{q1}$ is greater than 7 unless $q=2$. The definition of the matrix C shows that $C_{\nu+2,1}=7$, so from (5.1) it follows that $A_{\nu+2,2}+B_{21}=7$. Item 5 implies that $A_{\nu+2,2}=0$, and we therefore obtain $B_{21}=7$.

10. Now let $i\in\{1,\ldots,\nu\}$ and either $j=i$ or $j=i+1$. The definition of the matrix C implies $C_{ij}\leq 10i+10j-10$. From items 6 and 7 it then follows that the numbers A_{i3}, A_{i4}, and B_{1j} are always greater than C_{ij}. The equation (5.1) therefore implies $A_{i2}+B_{2j}=C_{ij}$. We thus obtain the following system of $2\nu+1$ linear (in the classical sense) equations with $2\nu+1$ real unknowns: $B_{21}=7$ and

$$A_{i2}+B_{2i}=C_{ii},\;\; A_{i2}+B_{2,i+1}=C_{i,i+1},\text{ for every } i\in\{1,\ldots,\nu\}. \tag{5.3}$$

Solving the system, we obtain that, in particular, $B_{2,\nu+1}=10\nu+6$. From the equation (5.1) it thus follows that $C_{\nu+2,\nu+1}\leq A_{\nu+2,2}+B_{2,\nu+1}$. Item 5 shows that $A_{\nu+2,2}=0$, so that $C_{\nu+2,\nu+1}\leq 10\nu+6$. However, the definition of C shows that $C_{\nu+2,\nu+1}=10\nu+7$. The contradiction obtained shows that our initial assumption is not true, so the result follows. □

Let us show that every ν-by-ν submatrix of $C(\nu)$ has factor rank at most 4.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\mu\in\{1,\ldots,\nu+1\}$. The matrix C' that is obtained from $C(\nu)$ by removing the μth column has factor rank at most* 4.

Proof. We need to provide matrices $A\in\mathbb{R}^{(\nu+6)\times 4}$ and $B\in\mathbb{R}^{4\times(\nu+5)}$ satisfying $A\otimes B=C'$. Denoting an arbitrary number from $\{1,\ldots,\nu+1\}$ by i, from $\{1,\ldots,\nu+1\}\setminus\{\mu\}$ by j, we can construct these matrices as follows.

We set $A_{i1}=0$ and $A_{i3}=A_{i4}=20i+1$ for every i, $A_{i2}=10i-7$ if $i<\mu$, $A_{i2}=10i-8$ if $\mu\leq i<\nu+1$, and $A_{\nu+1,2}=20\nu+21$. Set also $B_{1j}=20j-9$ and $B_{4j}=0$ for every j, $B_{3j}=10j-3$ if $j\neq 1$, $B_{3j}=11$ if $j=1$. Define $B_{2j}=10j-3$ if either $j<\mu$ or $j=\nu+1$, set $B_{2j}=10j-2$ if $\mu<j<\nu+1$.

Finally, we define the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 10\nu+7 \\ 0 & 11 & 0 & 11 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} 20\nu+20 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 20\nu+20 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

to be, respectively, the matrix formed by the rows of A with numbers $\nu+2, \ldots, \nu+6$ and the matrix formed by the columns of B with numbers $\nu+2, \ldots, \nu+6$. The product $A \otimes B$ can now be straightforwardly checked to equal the matrix C'. $\square$

Note that the factor rank of a submatrix is always less than or equal to the factor rank of whole matrix, Theorem 5.3 thus implies that every submatrix of $C(\nu)$ of size at most ν-by-ν has factor rank at most 4. Therefore, the matrix $C(\nu)$ gives a negative answer for Question 1.4 if $k = 4$. We are now ready to prove the main result of this section, and answer Question 1.4 for every $k \geq 4$.

Theorem 5.4. *Let k and ν be integers and $k \geq 4$. There exists a tropical matrix $\mathcal{C}(k, \nu)$ with the following properties: (i) the factor rank of $\mathcal{C}(k, \nu)$ is greater than k; (ii) every minor of $\mathcal{C}(k, \nu)$ of size at most ν-by-ν has factor rank at most k.*

Proof. Apply Proposition 2.6 and then Lemma 2.5 to the matrix from Example 5.1. $\square$

References

[1] M. Akian, S. Gaubert, A. Guterman. *Linear independence over tropical semirings and beyond*, Contemporary Mathematics, AMS, **495**(2009) 1–38.

[2] A.I. Barvinok. *Combinatorial Optimization and Computations in the Ring of Polynomials*, DIMACS Technical Report 93-13, 1993.

[3] A.I. Barvinok. *Two Algorithmic Results for the Traveling Salesman Problem*, Mathematics of Operations Research, **21(1)**(1996), 65–84.

[4] A. Barvinok, E. Kh. Gimadi, A. I. Serdyukov. *The maximum traveling salesman problem*, in: The Traveling Salesman problem and its variations (G. Gutin and A. Punnen, eds.), Kluwer, 2002.

[5] A. Barvinok, D.S. Johnson, G.J. Woeginger, and R. Woodroofe. *The maximum traveling salesman problem under polyhedral norms*, Integer programming and combinatorial optimization, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci, **1412**, Springer, Berlin, 1998.

[6] F. Baccelli, G. Cohen, G.J. Olsder, J.P. Quadrat. Synchronization and Linearity, Wiley, 1992.

[7] L. B. Beasley, *Isolation number versus Boolean rank*, Linear Algebra Appl., **436**(2012), 3469–3474.

[8] L. B. Beasley, S. J. Kirkland, B. L. Shader. *Rank comparisons*, Linear Algebra Appl., **221**(1995), 171–188.

[9] L. B. Beasley, N. J. Pullman. *Semiring rank versus column rank*, Linear Algebra Appl., **101**(1988), 33–48.

[10] E. Cela, R. Rudolf, G. Woeginger, *On the Barvinok rank of matrices*, presentation at the 2nd Aussois Workshop on Combinatorial Optimization, February 1998.

[11] J. E. Cohen, U. G. Rothblum. *Nonnegative ranks, decompositions, and factorizations of nonnegative matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl., **190**(1993), 149–168.

[12] R. A. Cuninghame-Green. Minimax algebra, volume **166** of Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979.

[13] M. Develin, *The moduli space of n tropically collinear points in $\mathbb{R}^d$*, Collect. Math., **56(1)**(2005), 1–19.

[14] M. Develin, *Tropical Secant Varieties of Linear Spaces*, Discr. Comp. Geom., **35(1)**(2006), 117–129.

[15] M. Develin, F. Santos, B. Sturmfels. *On the rank of a tropical matrix*, in: Discrete and Computational Geometry (E. Goodman, J. Pach and E. Welzl, eds.), MSRI Publications, Cambridge Univ., Press, 2005.

[16] M. Einsiedler, M. Kapranov, D. Lind. *Non-Archimedean amoebas and tropical varieties*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **601**(2006), 139–157.

[17] J. Ferrante, C. Rackoff. *A decision procedure for the first order theory of real addition with order*, SIAM J. Computing, **4**(1975), 69–76.

[18] A. Guterman, Ya. Shitov. *Tropical patterns of matrices and the Gondran–Minoux rank function*, Linear Algebra Appl., to appear.

[19] B. Heidergott, G. J. Olsder, J. van der Woude. Max Plus at Work: Modeling and Analysis of Synchronized Systems: A Course on Max- Plus Algebra and Its Applications, Princeton Univ. Press, 2006.

[20] A. Hultman, J. Jonsson, The topology of the space of matrices of Barvinok rank two, arXiv:0902.3380v1.

[21] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson. Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness, W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1979.

[22] S. Gaubert. *On the Burnside problem for semigroups of matrices in the* (max, +) *algebra*, Semigroup Forum **52**(1996), 271–292.

[23] S. Gaubert, M. Plus. *Methods and applications of (max,+) linear algebra*, in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, **1200**, Springer Verlag, New York, 1997.

[24] D. A. Gregory, N. J. Pullman, *Biclique Coverings of Regular Bigraphs and Minimum Semiring Ranks of Regular Matrices*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B, **51**(1991), 73–89.

[25] Z. Izhakian, M. Johnson, M. Kambites, *Tropical matrix groups*, arXiv:1203.2449.

[26] M. Johnson, M. Kambites, Multiplicative structure of 2×2 tropical matrices, Linear Algebra Appl. 435 (2011) 1612–1625.

[27] L. G. Khachiyan. *Polynomial algorithms in linear programming*, USSR Comp. Math. and Math. Phys., **20(1)**(1980), 53–72.

[28] V. N. Kolokoltsov, V. P. Maslov. Idempotent analysis and applications. Kluwer Acad. Publishers, 1997.

[29] W. M. McEneaney. Max-plus methods for nonlinear control and estimation, Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2006.

[30] N. Megiddo. *Towards a Genuinely Polynomial Algorithm for Linear Programming*, SIAM J. Comput. **12**(1983), 347–353.

[31] J.-E. Pin. *Tropical semirings*, In Idempotency (Bristol, 1994), Publ. Newton Inst., **11**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998.

[32] I. Simon. *Limited Subsets of a Free Monoid*, in Proc. 19th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Piscataway, N.J., Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, 1978.

[33] N. N. Vorobyev. *Extremal algebra of positive matrices*, Elektron. Informationsverarbeitung und Kybernetik, **3**(1967), 39–71.

E-mail address: `yaroslav-shitov@yandex.ru`